## **REMARKS**

Claims 1 - 22 are pending in the Patent Application.

Claims 1 - 22 are rejected.

The disclosure is objected to because of an informality in Paragraph 24, page 6 of the Specification. This informality has been corrected by appropriately substituting -the structures 30, 28 -- for "the structures 30, 32", as recommended by Examiner Applicants appreciate Examiner's attention to this matter.

The objection to Claim 1, line 6, has been overcome by changing "an excitation source" to --the excitation source--.

Claims 1 – 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The various rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been addressed as follows:

For Claim 1, the phrase "can be" has been replaced by --is--, so that Claim 1 (as amended) is now definite in reciting the nature of the invention.

For Claim 4, in the phrase "the linear progressive phase shift in the electromagnetic wave along the feed source", "the" has been replaced by --a--, as the language has been incorporated into independent Claim 1, so as to overcome the insufficient antecedent basis rejection.

For Claim 7, in the phrase "the sinuous feed", "the" has been replaced by --a--, so as to overcome the insufficient antecedent basis rejection.

For Claim 10, the phrase "can be" has been replaced by --is--, so that Claim 10 (as amended) is now definite in reciting the nature of the invention.

For Claim 11, in the phrase "the linear progressive phrase shift", "the" has been replaced by --a--, as incorporated into independent Claim 10, so as to overcome the insufficient antecedent basis rejection.

For Claim 17, in the phrase "each subarray sinuous feed", "each" has been deleted, so as to overcome the insufficient antecedent basis rejection.

For Claim 19, in the phrase "each subarray sinuous feed", "each" has been deleted, so as to overcome the insufficient antecedent basis rejection.

Examiner states that Claims 4-8 and 11-19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants believe that by proper amendments to the claims, as set forth and explained above, the rejections to the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, have been overcome thereby.

Applicants have rewritten Claim 4 by incorporating the features of Claim 4, including the features of intervening Claim 2, into independent Claim 1. Consequently, Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, each of which depends directly from allowable independent Claim 1, and each, respectively, recites additional features thereto, are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 11 has been rewritten by incorporating the features of Claim 11 into independent Claim 10; there are no intervening claims. Therefore, Claim 10 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 12 and 13, each of which depends directly from allowable independent Claim 10, and each, respectively, recites additional features thereto, are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 14 has been rewritten by incorporating the features of Claim 14 into independent Claim 10 (there are no intervening claims), as newly presented Claim 23. Consequently, new Claim 23 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19, each of which depends (directly or indirectly) from allowable independent Claim 23, and each, respectively, recites additional features thereto, are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 20 - 22 have been canceled by this Amendment.

In conclusion, Applicants request that Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 23 be allowed and that the case pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Leonard A. Alkov, Attorney for Applicants

Tel. No. 310.647.2577 Fax No. 310.647.2616

Raytheon Company P.O. Box 902 (E4/N119) El Segundo, CA 90245-0902